

Approved  
10 May 2010  
CFU



# MINUTES ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

April 12, 2010

7:30 P.M.

City Hall, Council Chambers  
Fredericksburg, Virginia

## MEMBERS

Lisa Peverill, Vice Chair  
Owen Lindauer  
Jamie Scully  
Donna Chasen  
J. Gordon Brown

## MEMBERS ABSENT

Robin Wood, Chair  
Marilynn Mendell

## CITY STAFF

Erik Nelson, Senior Planner  
Sheree Waddy, Recording Secretary

Ms. Peverill called the Architectural Review Board to order at 7:30 p.m.

## OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Peverill determined that a quorum was present. Mr. Nelson stated that public notice requirements had been met.

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Peverill asked if there were additional items for the agenda.

Mr. Nelson asked to add the following items to Other Business:

7. Informal review of awnings at 1005 Princess Anne Street.
8. Transmittal of NAPC newsletter.

Mr. Lindauer made a motion to accept the agenda as amended. Mr. Scully seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

## REVIEW OF MINUTES

Ms. Peverill asked if there were any changes to the March 8, 2010 and March 22, 2010 meeting minutes.

Ms. Chasen made a motion to accept the minutes, for both meetings, as submitted. Mr. Brown seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

## **DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS**

Ms. Peverill asked if any board member had a conflict of interest or had participated in ex parte communications on any of the agenda items. No one said that they had.

## **APPLICATIONS – REGULAR AGENDA**

### **1. 305 William Street (Courtney Harris) – Signs**

The applicant, Courtney Harris, was present.

James Lawrence, 802 Caroline Street, thanked the applicant for being present and asked what color the signs would be.

Mr. Lindauer thanked Ms. Harris for being present, said that the application was a fine proposal, commented that the sign appeared to meet all the standards for signs in the Historic District, and said he had no concerns.

Mr. Scully asked how the sign would be attached.

Mr. Nelson explained that the sign would be attached to a metal bracket screwed into the wood components of the storefront cornice.

Mr. Brown asked for clarification on where the sign would be attached.

Mr. Nelson said it would be on the right pilaster, centered within the molding.

Mr. Lindauer said he found the proposed signs to be architecturally compatible with the historic aspects of the Historic District and made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Chasen seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

### **2. 1006 Caroline Street (Robert Payne) - Signs**

The applicant was not present.

James Lawrence, 802 Caroline Street, expressed support for the signs.

Mr. Scully asked how the sign allowance was calculated.

Mr. Nelson explained that the sign allowance is based on one and half times the linear frontage.

Mr. Lindauer noted that the signs appeared to meet the standards for signs in the Historic District and that he had no concerns.

Mr. Lindauer said he found the proposed signs to be architecturally compatible with the historic aspects of the Historic District and made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Chasen seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

### **3. 610 Caroline Street (Alicia Austin) – Awning and signs**

The applicant, Alicia Austin, was present.

James Lawrence, 802 Caroline Street, thanked the applicant for being present and asked if the applicant had a sample of the proposed awning material.

Mr. Brown asked if the dimensional letters would be attached individually into the mortar joints.

Ms. Austin said her sign contractor assured her the letters would be attached into the mortar.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Nelson who was responsible for repairing the holes used to attach signs to the building.

Mr. Nelson said the property owner was responsible.

Mr. Brown thanked the applicant for submitting a clear and complete application.

Mr. Scully asked if the clips being used to attach the letters would actually match up with the mortar lines.

Ms. Austin said her sign contractor assured her they would.

Mr. Scully also complimented the applicant on the submitted drawings.

Mr. Lindauer said he was concerned about the lettering. He asked the applicant to clarify why she chose dimensional lettering as opposed to painted on lettering that would be more in keeping with the historic aspects of the building.

Ms. Austin said she liked the look of dimensional lettering and wanted to maintain the integrity of the store's logo. She said she did not think painting the letters directly onto the building was allowed.

Mr. Lindauer said he liked the idea of a large sign at this location and although the dimensional lettering would be reversible he still had concerns about the number of holes required to attach the letters. He noted that there were several building that still had remnants of old signs painted on them.

Mr. Brown asked if the applicant had considered attaching the letters to a bar, which would require fewer holes drilled into the facade.

Ms. Austin said she had not considered an alternative method of installation. She added that she did not object to using a bar or painted lettering as long as she could use the same font and size.

Mr. Brown noted that there were not many signs like this in the Historic District and he was concerned about the damage that would be caused by attaching so many letters individually.

Mr. Lindauer asked Mr. Nelson to clarify what would be involved if the applicant chose to change to painted lettering.

Mr. Nelson said that the sign dimensions are the maximum allowance for the building. He said there would be no problem if the applicant chose painted lettering.

Mr. Lindauer said he found the proposed awnings and signs to be architecturally compatible with the historic aspects of the Historic District and made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the wall sign be either painted onto the façade (which is already painted) or dimensional lettering mounted on a bar or backboard to be attached to the façade with no more than ten holes. Mr. Scully seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **4. 525 Princess Anne Street (Shiloh Baptist Church (New Site)) – Exterior alterations**

The applicant was not present.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Brown asked if the two plywood covered windows facing Caroline Street had sashes in them.

Mr. Nelson said he did not know.

Mr. Brown noted the glass in the other windows had the distortions and imperfection of original glass and said he would not be in favor of replacing them.

Mr. Lindauer said that according to Section 78-759(a)(6), deteriorated architectural features should be repaired rather than replaced when possible. He agreed with Mr. Brown and recommended preserving the windows. He said if the windows cannot be repaired then the replacement windows should match the original windows in composition, design and other visual qualities, as outlined in the Ordinance.

Mr. Lindauer made a motion that these windows are a character defining characteristic of this historic church and that replacement would be inconsistent with Section 78-759(a)(6) of the Historic District ordinance and that repairs, including replacement of components, would be appropriate, but complete replacement of the windows would not. In addition, if replacement sashes are required for the covered windows they will require ARB review. Mr. Scully seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. City of Fredericksburg Trailhead and security features for Rappahannock River Heritage Trail – The Board discussed the features. Mr. Lindauer made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed chain link fence or a two rail pipe fence, whichever is most appropriate based on conditions and cost, and the proposed signage package as presented. Mr. Brown seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Transmittal of Planning Commission agenda – Mr. Nelson noted that the only item was the draft Preservation Plan. He said that the Commission had extended the public comment period.
3. Demolition of 312½ Wolfe Street – The Building Maintenance Code Official has determined the building is unsafe and has ordered demolition of the structure, which takes the issue out of the ARB's purview.
4. Informal review of signs and a clock at the railway station – The Bavarian Chef restaurant will be moving into the train station and would like to install a clock tower with their name on the face of the clock, which would constitute a freestanding sign. They are considering attaching the clock to building. They will be presenting an application in May.
5. Transmittal of proposed revisions to Rules of Procedure – Mr. Nelson transmitted proposed revisions for the Board's review and discussion. He explained that they could not vote on the revisions until the May meeting, at the earliest.
6. Transmittal of draft recommendation for visibility issue – Mr. Nelson said that he is still researching this issue and will have additional information for the May meeting.
7. Informal review of 1005 Princess Anne Street – Mr. Nelson said that the Otter House was planning to apply for an EDA grant to install a canopy. He said that before they presented their plans to the EDA they wanted to get an idea of what the Board would approve. Mr. Nelson presented drawings of the proposed awnings for the Board's review. Mr. Scully suggested that lights would be needed. There were no negative comments or cautionary statements.
8. Transmittal of the NAPC newsletter.

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.



---

Lisa Peverill, Vice Chair